

Information Technology Resource Management Council (ITRMC)

Special Meeting Minutes

(Approved by Council December 7, 2001)

October 17, 2001

8:30 to 10:10 p.m., East Conference Room, JRW Building
700 West State Street, Boise, Idaho

The October 17, 2001 meeting of the Information Technology Resource Management Council (ITRMC) was held in the East Conference Room of the JRW Building, 700 West State Street, Boise, Idaho.

CALL TO ORDER, WELCOME

Pam Ahrens, Council Chairman, who welcomed members and guests present, called the meeting to order.

ATTENDANCE

Members/Designates Present:

Mrs. Pam Ahrens, Chairman
Mr. Dwight Bower, Idaho Transportation Dept.
Senator Hal Bunderson, Idaho Senate
Mr. Ken Harward, Association of Idaho Cities
Dr. Marilyn Howard, Department of Education
Senator Bert Marley, Idaho Senate
Mr. John Peay, Idaho Supreme Court
Mr. Gary Stivers, State Board of Education
Colonel E.D. Strickfaden, Idaho State Police
Mr. Steve Wilson, Idaho Tax Commission
*Mr. Keith Johnson, State Controller's Office
*Mr. Charlie Wright, Dept. of Health and Welfare

*Designate

Absent Members:

Representative Lee Gagner, Idaho House
Mrs. Mary Jones, College of Southern Idaho
Mr. Karl Kurtz, Dept. of Health and Welfare
Mr. Roger Parks, J R Simplot Company
Senator Clint Stennett, Idaho Senate
Mr. J.D. Williams, State Controller

Others Present:

Mr. Nathan Bentley, ITRMC Staff
Mr. Rich Elwood, ITRMC Staff
Mr. Bill Farnsworth, ITRMC Staff
Mr. Don Fournier, ITRMC Staff
Ms. Emily Gales, ITRMC Staff
Mr. Scott Somerhalder, Idaho Information Consortium

ITRMC UPDATE

Chairman Ahrens introduced and welcomed **Gary Stivers**, newly appointed Executive Director of the State Board of Education, as the newest member of ITRMC.

ITRMC IT POLICIES

Rich Elwood, Statewide IT Coordinator, explained the critical nature of having the Council's approval on some policies, standards and guidelines before the December 7th ITRMC meeting. Comments received on certain policies would be discussed. As mentioned at ITRMC's October 2nd meeting, the ITRMC Staff would be re-prioritizing a couple of items previously scheduled for later in the year. As an enabling process in the development of a state IT Security Plan, the Staff would bring forth a framework policy. In addition, the Staff's priority on the development of a business recovery guideline had been increased. G100, Information Technology Planning, Category G115 Business Recovery Plan, would be presented to the Council later in the meeting. Policies 1040 (Electronic Mail and Messaging Use), 1050 (Employee Internet Use), and 1060 (Employee Personal Computer Use) would also be reviewed for approval. These policies would be covered together, as in Executive Order 98-05 (signed by Governor Batt) and a draft executive order being considered by Governor Kempthorne. Due to specific details within each area, three separate policies were drafted. The intent was to clarify and add more detail than the existing and proposed executive orders, which refer to ITRMC's responsibility to establish more detailed policies in the specified areas. A memorandum from Dwight Bower, Idaho Transportation Department (ITD), expressing concerns about these draft policies, as well as some standards, would also be addressed.

Discussion of Memorandum from Dwight Bower

Policy 1040, 'Policy', paragraph *B. Employees may occasionally use electronic mail for....* ITD's comment: 'It is assumed that personal time is a broad statement, which can be left to the state agency to be more specific if necessary.' Rich Elwood advised that was absolutely the case. State agencies had the responsibility and authority to amplify elements of these ITRMC policies, if necessary.

Policy 1040, 'Policy', paragraph F., Item 15. *Registering to non-state business related list servers....* ITD's comment: 'Many publications are automatically distributed via list servers. It is assumed that it is agency management's responsibility to determine what list servers are authorized.' Mr. Elwood agreed that was absolutely the case; there were an ever-increasing number of publications offering daily updates through the e-mail system. It would certainly be within the responsibility and authority of any agency to direct what number of those might be acceptable. The policy principle was that the e-mail system not be unnecessarily flooded with subscriptions to every one of those services.

Policy 1040, 'Policy', paragraph F., Item 16. *Lobbying elected officials or engaging in any other....* ITD's comment: 'What political activities does law prohibit? Is there an Idaho code or DHR [Division of Human Resources] Rule that identifies this?' Elwood advised there were laws that governed political activity by state employees using state resources. The draft executive order

being considered by Governor Kempthorne prohibited employees from ‘conduct[ing] political activity using the e-mail system’. The ITRMC Staff felt Policy 1040 was in harmony with that order, but perhaps there needed to be a change in wording. There was more discussion on the principle of the policy. Chairman Ahrens suggested the policy refer back to the section of Idaho code that prohibited political activity by state employees. Also, the reference to lobbying elected officials should be removed. There was more discussion on lobbying. **Senator Hal Bunderson** suggested the policy forbid *any* activity prohibited by law. Mr. Elwood agreed the lobbying aspect should be removed, and proposed the sentence read ‘engaging in any political activity prohibited by law...’. Chairman Ahrens recommended items 16 and 18 be combined into one statement, so that the message of prohibiting any activity prohibited by law would be conveyed. It was decided to leave item 16 remaining, stating that engaging in any political activity prohibited by law was forbidden, and to remove the piece on lobbying.

Policy 1040, ‘Policy’, paragraph F., Item 17. *Altering, copying or forwarding a message....* ITD’s comment: ‘Impossible to enforce. There are times when forwarding is appropriate. For example an FYI to a supervisor. It is a common practice to copy or forward e-mail to a supervisor when they have been left off a distribution list.’ Elwood agreed this was a good point. There were a couple principles that led to the inclusion of item 17: the intent of the person forwarding/originator of e-mail, and security issues (some organizations prohibit the forwarding of e-mail/acceptance of forwarded e-mail because of the difficulty in controlling the spread of viruses through e-mail). Also, some individuals specify in their e-mails that they may not be forwarded without permission. This was a difficult problem, and Elwood was unsure of how to control it. Perhaps the wording needed to be changed. However, changing the content of an original e-mail and forwarding on as if it were an original was not an acceptable practice, he said. **Colonel E.D. Strickfaden** advised the adoption of the policy would really interfere with the way the State Police did business/collected information. There was more discussion regarding the forwarding of e-mail. It was decided item 17 would be eliminated and addressed at a later time.

Policy 1040, ‘Responsibility’, *Use of the E-mail system by state employees is a privilege....* ITD’s comment: ‘Some processes are starting to require the use of e-mail. That makes it no longer a privilege but a necessary tool to do agency business.’ Mr. Elwood advised the point was that, in either case (whether privilege or necessary), the same responsibilities applied, but the wording could be changed. It was decided to eliminate the first sentence of the paragraph.

Policy 1040, ‘Responsibility’, paragraph B. *Users should retain messages only if relevant to the business....* ITD’s comment: ‘In general this policy should refer to the policy given in the Records Management Handbook (Appendix A-7-2)...’ An alternative statement for paragraph B. was included for consideration. Elwood advised this was an excellent point. After looking at the comments made, the Staff found that paragraph E under the ‘Policy’ section stated that e-mail was considered state property, constituted official records of the State of Idaho, and was subject to existing document retention and public records policies. The Staff felt that was a broader explanation, and that paragraph B. of the ‘Responsibility’ section could actually be removed.

Other Discussion

Policy 1040, 'Abstract', second paragraph *'The purpose of this policy is to ensure proper use of the State of Idaho's....'* Senator Bunderson suggested the word 'efficient' be inserted. The sentence would then read 'The purpose of this policy is to ensure proper and efficient use of the State of Idaho's electronic mail and messaging systems by its employees.'

There was discussion regarding the number of e-mail systems that existed within the state. There was also a brief discussion about accessing outside/personal e-mail accounts via state computers.

Policy 1040, 'Policy', paragraph C., second sentence. **John Peay**, Idaho Supreme Court, suggested the word 'State' be changed to 'department' or 'agency' for consistency i.e. Policy 1060, 'Policy', paragraph A. It was decided to change the sentence to read 'The *agency* has the right to monitor any employee's E-mail...'

Dwight Bower advised he thought the second sentence (paragraph C.), up to the first comma, was a statement in itself. Colonel Strickfaden agreed. Senator Bert Marley suggested the word 'business' be removed from the sentence. It was decided the sentence should read 'The agency has the right to monitor any employee's E-mail account.'

Mr. Peay inquired as to why there was no reference to the issue of an employee knowingly passing along an e-mail with an attachment with a virus contained in it. Mr. Elwood advised Policy 1050 did cover creation/propagation of viruses, worms, etc. He added that perhaps the same statement should be included in Policy 1040, as well.

Steve Wilson, Idaho Tax Commission, mentioned that, occasionally, employees were instructed to forward suspicious e-mail to a member of the Commission's IT staff. The staff member could then open the e-mail under controlled circumstances, without affecting the agency. It was suggested that when referring to the propagation of computer viruses, worms, etc., language be added to indicate that doing so with intent to do harm was prohibited.

MOTION TO APPROVE ITRMC IT POLICY 1040

Dwight Bower moved and John Peay seconded a motion to adopt ITRMC Information Technology Policy 1040, Employee Electronic Mail and Messaging Use, with suggested changes, and the motion passed unanimously.

Continuation of Discussion of Memorandum from Dwight Bower

Policy 1050, 'Policy', paragraph B. *Employees may occasionally use the Internet for individual, nonpolitical....* ITD's comment: It is assumed that personal time is a broad statement, which can be left to the state agency to be more specific if necessary.' Rich Elwood advised this concern had been covered earlier in the meeting, and that it was the responsibility of state agencies to be more specific, if necessary.

Policy 1050, 'Policy', paragraph *I. Users may only download software with direct business use and must take...* and paragraph *J. Users may not download images or video unless there is a direct business-related use for such.* ITD's comment: 'Does this include web shots?' Mr. Elwood advised that this issue was addressed under the 'Policy' section of the policy, paragraph C. 'Users may not download, store, transmit, or display any kind of image or document...'. This statement would allow the elimination of paragraph J. under 'Policy'.

Policy 1050, 'Policy', paragraph *M. An Internet user can be held accountable for any breaches of policy,...* ITD's comment: 'Internet is no longer a privilege. Many systems require Internet access which makes it a required tool for agency business.' Elwood suggested perhaps the word 'privilege' should be removed, and the statement made broader. It was decided the second sentence would read 'Such violations of this policy may result in disciplinary action.'

MOTION TO APPROVE ITRMC IT POLICY 1050

Senator Bert Marley moved and Steve Wilson seconded a motion to adopt ITRMC Information Technology Policy 1050, Employee Internet Use, with suggested changes, and the motion passed unanimously.

Policy 1060, 'Policy', paragraph *B. Employees may occasionally use personal computers for individual,...* ITD's comment: 'It is assumed that personal time is a broad statement, which can be left to the state agency to be more specific if necessary.' Mr. Elwood agreed this comment was absolutely true.

Policy 1060, 'Policy', paragraph *F. Users may not load or download entertainment software and games,...* ITD's comment: 'Is this necessary as it is management's responsibility to ensure employees' time is used wisely?' and 'Does entertainment include audio, web shots, etc.?' Mr. Elwood agreed the first comment was absolutely true. Although, the draft executive order before Governor Kempthorne prohibited use of state computers to play games, period. Pertaining to this issue, this policy was in harmony with the draft executive order, and provided a more detailed explanation/furtherance of what the intent of the proposed executive order was. Elwood added that the use of audio or web shots could be defined by the agency.

There was more discussion on the violation of state law with regard to playing/downloading games on state-owned computers.

Policy 1060, 'Policy', *I. Users should take steps to ensure access to personal computers is secure and limited to...* ITD's comment: 'What steps? Are steps to be identified by each agency?' Dwight Bower advised he'd rather this paragraph made a definitive statement that users *are to ensure* access to personal computers is secure, etc. The sentence would be changed to reflect that.

Other Discussion

Policy 1060, 'Policy', paragraph *G. The state has the right to inspect any and all files stored in secured areas...* Rich Elwood suggested the addition of verbiage worked out at the October 2nd Special Meeting Minutes, October 17, 2001

ITRMC meeting, which specified that the agency had the right (or may authorize someone) to inspect any and all files stored in secured areas, etc.

MOTION TO ADOPT ITRMC IT POLICY 1060

Senator Bunderson moved and Colonel E.D. Strickfaden seconded a motion to adopt ITRMC Information Technology Policy 1060, Employee Personal Computer Use, with suggested changes, and the motion was passed unanimously by the eight voting members present. *Affirmative votes were subsequently obtained via fax from Karl Kurtz and Mary Elizabeth Jones, bringing the total vote in the affirmative to 10.*

Policy 2050 – IT Security Framework

Chairman Ahrens asked **Don Fournier**, ITRMC Staff, to discuss ITRMC IT Policy 2050. Mr. Fournier continued with Rich Elwood's comment regarding additional focus on a state IT security plan by the ITRMC Staff. Part of that process was the adoption of the Information Technology Security Framework Policy that was before the Council. To illustrate the purpose of the framework, Mr. Fournier provided a brief example. In doing so, Fournier pointed out that the security professionals within the state knew well that security was a very broad area, and there were a lot of issues involved in the security arena. One of the focuses of Policy 2050 was to frame just how big this area was, and to place it in a context that could be agreed upon and understood. The policy was to provide a framework for information technology security within the state, and within that framework, IT planning and efforts already existing within the state could then proceed. Existing policies, procedures and standards would fall within the framework. The ten items on the framework were based on the ISO (International Organization for Standardization) model. The ten domains of the ISO International Security standards were selected to provide an open standard that was not proprietary or connected to any consulting firm. The policy specified what the ten domains were, and what they would be used for within the state. It would serve as the framework for the state's IT Security Plan, and for security efforts within the state.

In answer to an inquiry made by Steve Wilson, Mr. Fournier advised that based on the IT Security Framework, an overall IT security plan for the state – as an enterprise – would at some point be drafted. He also advised that agency security plans would, in theory, feed into that overall state security plan, and would incorporate the ten domains identified in the framework.

Mr. Wilson advised he had just returned from the Federation of Tax Administrators' Safeguard and Security Workshop on common criteria for a federal standard for evaluating security, and inquired as to whether common criteria needed to be specifically mentioned in the Framework Policy. Fournier advised the intent of drafting the framework in a broad fashion was that common criteria – as well as IETF (Internet Engineering Task Force) and other industry standards – would fall under one of the ten domains identified. This model was selected because of the flexibility it had to incorporate the common criteria in other industry standard requirements that were used in security programs. Wilson added that other agencies would have similar requirements perhaps different from other trading partners, and wanted to ensure the policy would not restrict an agency with respect to dealings with federal agencies and other entities (partners).

Colonel E.D. Strickfaden advised he did not understand how the policy might impact his organization. Mr. Fournier advised it would not have any direct impact on the Idaho State Police at that point. The intent was to frame the way for the state IT Security Plan, and to establish a framework and context for the IT security community within the state.

Dwight Bower questioned the significance of the timeline associated with Policy 2050 (immediate implementation). Rich Elwood advised immediate implementation allowed the ITRMC Staff to move forward with the development of a plan to develop the state IT Security Plan, which would heavily involve all the agencies with interest in this area. The Staff would then bring forth a list of goals and objectives for such a development plan. A list of people the Staff would like to involve in a committee (including a Chair from the ITRMC) overseeing the creation of the plan would also be brought forth.

MOTION TO ADOPT ITRMC IT POLICY 2050

Dwight Bower moved and Dr. Marilyn Howard seconded a motion to adopt ITRMC Information Technology Policy 2050, Information Technology Security Framework, and the motion was passed by seven of the eight voting members present. (Colonel E.D. Strickfaden abstained from voting.) *Affirmative votes were subsequently obtained via fax from Karl Kurtz and Mary Elizabeth Jones, bringing the total vote in the affirmative to 9.*

ITRMC IT ENTERPRISE STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES

Due to time constraints, Chairman Ahrens inquired as to whether any of the proposed standards could be moved forward without any discussion. **Bill Farnsworth** advised some standards were re-statements of what was stated in the original policies, with formatting changes. They included: Standards 2000, Software – Desktop & Notebook, Category 2100 Operating System, and Category 2110 Office Suite; and Standards 2500, Software – Server, Category 2510 Network Operating System.

Further Discussion of Memorandum from Dwight Bower

Enterprise Standards 2000, Software – Desktop & Notebook, Category 2100 Operating System (O/S), ‘Approved Product(s)’ ITD’s comments: ‘Is it necessary to specify versions or can it be stated as “current version”? Otherwise, policy becomes outdated very quickly and in constant need of revision.’ and ‘Win 95 is no longer approved for any reason? We are trying to replace all Win 95 in preparation for Office XP. What about MAC, Linux?’ Rich Elwood advised specific versions were stated to allow for the important period of testing and understanding of the impact the current version might have, and to avoid the problems that might be created from the use of versions that had not been tested with other components present. He mentioned that as of October 25th, Windows XP would be the current version, and the Staff would solicit input from a number of technical individuals within the state before making the decision that Windows XP was acceptable. With regard to ITD’s concern about Windows 95, Elwood advised with the introduction of Windows XP, Microsoft had dropped all support for Windows 95. With regard to ITD’s concern regarding MAC and Linux, the framework for policies and standards (Policy 1010) provided adequate means for exemption requests. The Staff did not want to set the two operating systems as standards for the

state because the maturity of some of the products, and this would defeat the purpose of a standard to have multiple operating systems beyond Microsoft and Unix.

Dwight Bower advised due to the exemption process, all further concerns/inquiries made by ITD need not be addressed.

Other Discussion

Steve Wilson advised those information systems managers he had an opportunity to talk with were less than comfortable with Standards 2000, Categories 2100 and 2110. They agreed, however, that standards in general were a good thing, and the benefits of statewide standardization outweighed the drawbacks.

Charlie Wright, Department of Health and Welfare, advised the state was trying to walk a very delicate line between security standardization and flexibility. The more we learn in this business, we almost certainly have to bear on the side of security, he said. He added that standardization was critical to obtain the security needed, and it was a constant battle between the flexibility desired by users and the security that needed to be enforced.

John Peay advised it was wonderful to have standardization. He then inquired as to the timeline for implementation on Standards 2000. Rich Elwood advised Policy 1010 (adopted August 29, 2001) included a two-year timeframe for adoption of standards. If agencies could not meet the two-year deadline, the exemption process was available. The Council would then decide whether the exemption would be granted. Mr. Peay advised it would be helpful to incorporate the two-year timeframe/include reference to Policy 1010 into all standards. He also suggested reference to the exemption process be included.

Senator Hal Bunderson advised he wanted to discuss his concern with regard to the number of e-mail systems existing within the state at ITRMC's December meeting. Chairman Ahrens suggested this issue be combined with Peay's concern into the development of a separate policy/standard, and requested the ITRMC Staff to prepare a recommendation.

MOTION TO ADOPT STANDARDS 2000, CATEGORIES 2100 AND 2110

Colonel E.D. Strickfaden moved and John Peay seconded a motion to adopt ITRMC IT Enterprise Standards 2000, Category 2100 Operating System and Category 2110 Office Suite, and the motion was passed unanimously by the eight voting members present. *Affirmative votes were subsequently obtained via fax from Karl Kurtz and Mary Elizabeth Jones, bringing the total vote in the affirmative to 10.*

Standards 2500, Software – Server, Category 2510 Network Operating System

Bill Farnsworth advised Standards 2500, Category 2510 Network Operating System, outlined Microsoft NT Server 4.0, Microsoft Windows 2000 Server, and Unix as the standards. He noted

that 76% of agencies that responded to the Staff's survey were using or converting to these platforms.

John Peay reiterated his suggestion to include timeline and exemption information in this standard.

Steve Wilson advised there was some discomfort among information systems managers with regard to this standard, but that it was understood there was an exemption process available. He restated that the benefits of statewide standardization outweighed the drawbacks.

Charlie Wright also reiterated his earlier comments regarding standardization.

MOTION TO ADOPT STADARDS 2500, CATEGORY 2510

John Peay moved and Dwight Bower seconded a motion to adopt ITRMC IT Enterprise Standards 2500, Software – Server, Category 2510 Network Operating System, and the motion was passed unanimously by the seven voting members present. *Affirmative votes were subsequently obtained via fax from Karl Kurtz and Mary Elizabeth Jones, bringing the total vote in the affirmative to 9.*

Due to time constraints, Standards 5000, Information and Data, Category 5110 Metatags, would be reviewed for approval at ITRMC's December 7, 2001 meeting.

Don Fournier advised it was important for the Council to adopt the guideline pertaining to business recovery planning, as it would be a very useful resource to state agencies. Chairman Ahrens agreed the Council needed to provide as much information to agencies as possible, as disaster recovery plans were being developed state-wide. Mr. Fournier advised that Policy 2020 (adopted August 29, 2001) established and enforced the need for IT business recovery planning at the agency level. Further, Governor Kempthorne's Executive Order 2001-13 required agencies to assess disaster preparedness to reflect changes in the environment as a result of the events of September 11th. Guideline G115 Business Recovery Plan was intended to provide assistance to agencies in the revision of existing IT recovery plans to both map to agencies' business needs and to comply with the executive order/current requirement. The approach taken was not an attempt to establish any particular methodology or standard for IT business recovery, but rather to provide guidelines and resources for agencies to ensure the plans, as they are evaluated, would meet ITRMC policies and executive orders. Fournier further explained the outline of the guideline. He advised the guideline was a very dynamic document, and the ITRMC Staff anticipated frequent revisions to it.

Steve Wilson suggested item 7 under 'Guideline' be expanded to address what kind of training was being referred to. Mr. Fournier advised the training was in reference to the execution of a plan, etc. This point would be clarified in the document.

With regard to items 15 and 16 under 'Guideline', Mr. Wilson advised most state agencies lacked an alternate operations site for off-site recovery. He advised a site could be outsourced (extremely expensive; ongoing cost) or the state could do it on its own. It didn't make sense for every agency to rent space and communications infrastructure to be ready to quickly recover from a disaster, if needed. To the extent the Council might be able to facilitate some movement on a business recovery site in which multiple agencies could use in the event of an emergency, that would be a very valuable thing on behalf of the state.

Chairman Ahrens advised if this guideline should pass, a couple items to address were: a cover memo (with the guideline) should be sent to agencies, and a letter should go to the Military Division indicating this was one of the issues where coordination was very critical. As the Division received all the agencies' disaster recovery plans, some commonality would surface.

Rich Elwood mentioned the ITRMC Staff had met with a potential off-site facility. He advised a group of people could be brought together in a collaborative fashion to develop a plan that would allow for some minimum level of hardware to be located at an off-site facility. The facility would handle many of the lower-level issues that might happen in a recovery, but could be expanded into a larger recovery, if necessary. The cost could be shared in such a way that it would not be an undo burden on any one agency. The Staff would hope to serve as a research and collaborative function. Chairman Ahrens noted there might be other state-owned sites available.

MOTION TO ADOPT GUIDELINES G100, CATEGORY G115

Dwight Bower moved and Senator Hal Bunderson seconded a motion to adopt ITRMC IT Enterprise Guidelines G100, Information Technology Planning, Category G115 Business Recovery Plan, and the motion was passed unanimously by the seven voting members present. *Affirmative votes were subsequently obtained via fax from Karl Kurtz and Mary Elizabeth Jones, bringing the total vote in the affirmative to 9.*

DISCUSSION / NEW BUSINESS

ITRMC members were reminded to register for the 2001 Digital Government Boot Camp for Idaho Policy Makers, to be held on October 25th at the Boise Centre on the Grove.

Keith Johnson encouraged members to look at an NECCC (National Electronic Commerce Coordinating Council) flyer regarding the 5th Annual NECCC Conference, to be held December 10-12, 2001 in Las Vegas, Nevada.

ADJOURNMENT

As there was no other new business to come before the Council, Chairman Pam Ahrens thanked those in attendance and adjourned the meeting at 10:10 a.m. The next ITRMC meeting, the 2001 Digital Government Boot Camp, was scheduled for Thursday, October 25, 2001 from 8:00 a.m.–5:00 p.m. at the Boise Centre on the Grove.

Respectfully submitted,

Emily Gales
ITRMC Assistant